DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 058 363 UD 012 045

TITLE	An Evaluation of Improving the Teaching of English as a Second Language in Poverty Area Schools.
INSTITUTION	New York Univ., N.Y. Center for Field Research and School Services.
SPONS AGENCY	New York City Public Schools, Brooklyn, N.Y.
PUB DATE	31 Aug 70
NOTE	80p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Compensatory Education Programs; Curriculum Evaluation; Educational Administration; Elementary Education; Elementary School Students; *English (Second Language); Inner City; Instructional Materials; *Program Evaluation; *Reading Programs; Spanish Speaking; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I; *New York City

ABSTRACT

The ESEA Title I sponsored program "Improving the Teaching of English as a Second Language, K-12" (in the School District of the City of New York) was in its third and final year during the school year 1969-70. The programs under consideration in this evaluation are the Linguistic Reader Projects (Merrill and Miami) and the Implementation of the English as a Second Language Program in Poverty-Area Schools in New York City. The focus of the Miami and Merrill Reader Projects was to be on a linguistic approach to the teaching of beginning reading. Instruction was to be provided by the regular classroom teacher in part of the time regularly scheduled for language arts. Workshops for all classroom teachers in the project were to be provided to focus on principles and methods of the respective series and an oral language program using the methods and materials of English as a second language to reinforce the materials and methods of the reading series. The focus for the second component was to include for early elementary, late elementary, and secondary schools, a central English Second Language Staff, assignment of 35 specially trained teachers to those poverty area schools with the most serious needs, and a special administrator specializing in the problems involved in implementing these activities and responsible for all personnel. (Author/JM)

ED 028963

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

AN EVALUATION OF
IMPROVING THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH
AS A SECOND LANGUAGE IN POVERTY AREA SCHOOLS

Evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10), performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1969-70 school year.

Professor Harvey Nadler
Project Director

Center for Field Research and School Services
School of Education
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

UD 012045

August 1970

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

School of Education
Center for Field Research and School Services
Office of Off-Campus Courses

51 PRESS BUILDING
WASHINGTON SQUARE, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10003
AREA 212 598-2898

August 31, 1970

Dr. Samuel D. McClelland
Acting Director
Bureau of Educational Research
BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY
OF NEW YORK
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Dear Dr. McClelland:

In fulfillment of the agreement dated February 6, 1970 between the New York City Public Schools and the Center for Field Research and School Services, I am pleased to submit two hundred and fifty copies of the final report, An Evaluation of Improving the Teaching of English As A Second Language in Poverty Area Schools.

The Bureau of Educational Research and the professional staff of the New York City Public Schools were most cooperative in providing data and facilitating the study in general. Although the objective of the team was to evaluate a project funded under Title I, this report goes beyond this goal. Explicit in this report are recommendations for modifications and improvement of the program. Consequently, this report will serve its purpose best if it is studied and discussed by all who are concerned with education in New York City -- the Board of Education, professional staff, students, parents, lay leaders, and other citizens. To this end, the study team is prepared to assist with the presentation and interpretation of its report. In addition, the study team looks forward to our continued affiliation with the New York City Public Schools.

You may be sure that New York University and its School of Education will maintain a continuing interest in the Schools of New York City.

Respectfully submitted,

Arnold Spinner
Director

AS:n

cc: Dean Daniel E. Griffiths

CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgments	I
Tables	II
Charts	III
I. Introduction	1
A. Program Objectives	2
B. Evaluation Objectives	2
C. Methods and Preparation	3
II. Defining the TESL	5
A. License Requirements	5
B. Background of Teachers in the Survey	7
C. In the Classroom	18
D. Teacher Ratings	24
E. Miscellaneous Observations	27
F. TESLs Assigned under Title I	27
G. The Average TESL in the Survey	29
III. The Merrill and The Miami Linguistic Reader Programs	30
IV. Students: Language, Placement, Evaluation	35
V. Curriculum Articulation	38
A. In Elementary Schools	38
B. In Secondary Schools	42
VI. The Central ESL Staff	45
VII. Summary and Recommendations	46
A. Summary	46
B. Recommendations	49
VIII. Appendices	54
A. Questionnaire for Teachers	55
B. Teacher Observation Checklist	63
C. Workshop Schedules – Linguistic Reading Programs	66
D. Textbooks: Authors and Titles	74

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Rather than try to thank the literally hundreds of individuals, teachers, district coordinators, assistant principals, and principals who helped make this evaluation possible, permit me to thank you who are involved in teaching English as a second language at whatever level, for the interest you take and the affection you feel for your students, for the joy you bring to them in helping them to communicate in a new tongue, and for the patience and understanding you bring to what must be a labor of love.

Special thanks must be given to Mrs. Clelia Belfrom, former acting Assistant Director, Bureau of English, in charge of ESL and Bilingual Programs for what she always gave during this evaluation in the early stages and the many years she has served the non-English speaking public of the City of New York, pupils and parents alike, to Mrs. Evelyn Kleban who continued the outstanding job she had begun when she became Coordinator for both the Merrill and the Miami Linguistic programs during the second year of the project (1968-69), to Mr. David Krulik, newly appointed Assistant Director of English in charge of ESL, who, while adjusting to a new environment and new responsibilities never said "no" to any request made by the evaluation team, and most especially to those teachers who took the time to so carefully write down detailed responses to every one of the forty questions on the questionnaire, and without whom this could not have been written.

Harvey Nadler

August 1970

TABLES

Page

Table

1. Licenses Held – Elementary School Teachers 8
2. Classroom Experience – Elementary School Teachers 8
3. University Training – Elementary School Teachers 10
4. Special Training – Elementary School Teachers 11
5. Specific Courses – Elementary School Teachers 12
6. Licenses Held – Secondary School Teachers 14
7. Classroom Experience – Secondary School Teachers 14
8. University Training – Secondary School Teachers 15
9. Special Training – Secondary School Teachers 16
10. Specific Courses – Secondary School Teachers 17
11. Membership in TESOL – Elementary School Teachers 18
12. ESL – Program Strengths and Weaknesses – Elementary School Teachers 19
13. Educational Assistants – Elementary School Teachers 20
14. Classroom Supervision – Elementary School Teachers 21
15. Membership in TESOL – Secondary School Teachers 22
16. ESL – Program Strengths and Weaknesses – Secondary School Teachers 23
17. Educational Assistants – Secondary School Teachers 23
18. Classroom Supervision – Secondary School Teachers 24
19. Teacher Ratings – Elementary and Secondary School Teachers 26
20. TESLS – Funded under Title I 28
21. Merrill Linguistic Reading Project 31
22. Miami Linguistic Reading Project 32
23. District Mean Reading Grade Scores 33
24. Grade Norms: Metropolitan Reading Achievement Test Scores 33
25. Student Make-Up – Elementary School Teachers 35
26. Student Placement and Evaluation – Elementary School Teachers 36
27. Annual Pupil Mobility in New York City Schools, 1962-1967 38
28. Summary of Textbooks Used – Elementary School Teachers 39
29. Teacher Source and Reference Tests – Elementary School Teachers 40
30. Texts – Teacher Choice – Elementary School Teachers 41
31. Textbook Selection – Elementary School Teachers 42
32. Summary of Textbooks – Secondary School Teachers 43
33. Textbook Selection – Elementary School Teachers 44

CHART

Page

Chart

1. The Average TESL in the Survey 29

I. INTRODUCTION

The Title I, ESEA sponsored program "Improving the Teaching of English as a Second Language, K-12" (in the School District of the City of New York) was in its third and final year during the school year 1969-1970. The programs under consideration in this evaluation are the Linguistic Reader Projects (Merrill and Miami) and the Implementation of the English as a Second Language Program in Poverty – Area Schools in New York City. A third component, the Science-in-Spanish project, under the direction of Dr. Carmen Sanguinetti, was eliminated from this evaluation because it had already been evaluated very favorably and because of budgetary limitations.

As stated in the Project Abstract, the focus of the Miami and Merrill Reader Projects was to be on a linguistic approach to the teaching of beginning reading. Instruction was to be provided by the regular classroom teacher in part of the time regularly scheduled for language acts. Workshops for all classroom teachers in the project were to be provided to focus on principles and methods of the respective series and an oral language program using the methods and materials of English as a second language to reinforce the materials and methods of the reading series.

The focus for the second component, according to the Project Abstract, was to include for early elementary, late elementary, and secondary schools, 1. a central ESL staff to provide:

a) effective leadership for the ESL program

b) Development and testing of new curriculum materials

c) Coordination of the work being done by the fifteen District Coordinators (hereinafter called D.C.E.S.L.S.) and by the teachers (hereinafter called T.E.S.L.S.) of pupils learning English as a Second Language in poverty areas.

2. Assignment of thirty-five TESLS to those poverty area schools with the most serious needs, twenth-five for early and later elementary schools, and ten for secondary levels. Final decisions on the assignment of these teachers was to be made at the community level after recommendations made to the Community Superintendents.

3. The then Acting-Assistant Director, in charge of English as a Second Language, was to devote virtually all of her time to the direction and implementation of these activities, including the responsibility for all personnel, all activities and all leadership functions. She was replaced in the early spring by an appointed assistant Director.

A. Program Objectives

To provide poverty area children whose first language is not English with the additional instruction required to bring them on a par with native speakers of the English language.

To provide training and supportive help, with respect to philosophy, techniques and materials, for teachers and supervisors responsible for educating second-language learners.

To enable second-language learners to join the mainstream and the work force of our society without the handicaps of inability to communicate in English.

To improve academic skills and knowledge, especially in listening, speaking, and reading the English language, with the concomitant mental and emotional security in being able to use English.

These objectives will be pursued with regard to early and later elementary, and secondary school pupils.

B. Evaluation Objectives

1. To determine how teachers of English as a second language is defined, i.e., in terms of an available position or in terms of a set of pre-determined qualifications.

2. The same determination will be made as to the District Coordinators, of ESL, and from the Central ESL staff of the Board, the supervisors and the Assistant Director of English in charge of the project.

3. To determine the extent to which the Merrill and the Miami Linguistic Readers are appropriate for this program.

4. To determine the degree to which these non-active speaking children are approximating equality with native speakers as to their English language skills.

5. To determine the extent to which there is a coordinated curriculum

a) at individual schools

b) throughout the system as a whole

in terms of textbooks employed.

6. To determine the methods of evaluation employed for promoting and for moving them into the mainstream with the native-speaking population.

7. To determine the classroom effectiveness of a sample of classroom teachers at early and later elementary and secondary schools.

8. To determine the effectiveness of the Board of Education Central ESL staff (the Assistant Director and the four supervisors).

9. To determine the ESL teacher:student ratios in schools, districts, throughout the city program.

C. Methods and Preparation

1) Evaluation objectives 1 and 2: In order to determine how respective positions are defined, questionnaires (see Appendix A) were employed to ascertain the qualifications of the various personnel as to academic training in ESL methodology and linguistics; knowledge of ESL texts and materials; experience at grade level, experience with ESL students and materials at grade level indicated. A questionnaire was prepared for this purpose.

2) Evaluation Objective 3: To determine the extent to which the linguistic orientation of the two sets of reading materials were appropriate for this program, scores on the Metropolitan Reading Achievement Test were obtained and compared with national and city wide norms as well as district wide results in poverty area schools.

3) Evaluation Objective 4: The standardized skill (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) tests employed by the Board staff were to be examined for the ability to compare the skills of the non-native speaking children with native speakers of English. The test scores were to be examined at the end of the third, sixth, ninth, and twelfth grade. This was to obtain a cross-sectional comparison at regular intervals at the end of the elementary grades for junior high school bound students (6th), the entrance to high school for non-junior high school students (9th), and the end of the senior year in high school (12th).

This proved an impossible task since students with English language difficulty are usually not permitted to take the standardized tests with native speakers.

4) Evaluation Objective 5: A questionnaire (see Appendix A) was used to determine which textbooks are employed throughout the system in order to establish the extent of a coordinated curriculum.

5) Evaluation Objective 6: The methods of evaluation used for promoting students and moving them into the mainstream was determined by responses to the questionnaire for teachers (See Appendix A).

6) Evaluation Objective 7: The "Teacher Observation Checklist" prepared during the second year of study (see Appendix B) was used to determine the classroom effectiveness of a sample of classroom teachers at elementary and secondary schools.

7) Evaluation Objective 8: Information obtained from the questionnaire (Appendix A) used in objectives 1, 2 and 5 above as well as interviews with classroom teachers, school supervisors, principals and district coordinators were used to determine the effectiveness of the Central ESL staff from the Board.

8) Evaluation Objective 9: Information obtained from the questionnaire used in objectives 1, 2, 5, and 7 and interviews with teachers and school supervisors were used to determine ESL teacher:student ratios.

II. DEFINING THE TESL

A. License Requirements

In an attempt to determine what constitutes a teacher of English as a second language, the evaluation team utilized two sources: 1) the Examination Announcements for licenses in teaching English as a second language in Day Elementary Schools (S1318) Alt. A) 68-70) and in Junior High and Day High Schools (S.331d) (Alt.A) (69-70) with their respective statements of eligibility requirements, both dated April, 1970, and 2) The Questionnaire for Teachers (See Appendix-A) prepared by the Evaluation team.

1. The requirements for Junior High and Day High School Teachers of English as a second language (S.331d, April 1970) requires

a) a baccalaureate degree, and

b) Either (1) a master's degree in or related to the field of teaching English as a second language or (2) thirty (30) semester hours of graduate study distributed among the liberal arts, the social and behavioral sciences, and professional study of education, including a minimum of six (6) semester hours in anthropology, sociology, human relations, or social psychology, or any combination thereof.

C. Twelve semester hours in the professional study of education, including at least two (2) semester hours in methods of teaching English as a second language and a college supervised student-teaching experience (on any school level except the college level and it need not be in the subject of the license applied for) or, the applicant may substitute one year of appropriate and satisfactory teaching of English as a second language in a secondary school, intermediate school, or in grade 7 or 8 of an elementary school, or one year of teaching a modern foreign language in a secondary school, an intermediate school, or in grade 7 or 8 of an elementary school.

d) 36 hours in approved courses distributed as follows

1) 30 semester hours in either English or a modern foreign language, and

2) 6 semester hours in the structure of modern English or introductory linguistics, or methods of comparative analysis, or phonetics or phonemics, or comparative analysis of English or (sic) any foreign language, or in any combination thereof.

2) The Board of Education Statement of Eligibility Requirements for Day

Elementary School teachers of English as a second language (S.318) (Alt.A) (April, 1970) requires

a. a baccalaureate degree, and

b. either

1) a Master's degree in or related to the field of teaching English as a second language, or

2) 30 semester hours of graduate study distributed among the liberal arts, the social and behavioral sciences, and professional study in education, including courses to the minimums indicated:

a) 12 semester hours in liberal arts in or related to the teaching of English as a second language, including a minimum of 6 semester hours in the structure of modern English, or introductory linguistics, or phonetics and phonemics, or comparative analysis of English and any foreign language, or in any combination thereof.

b) 14 semester hours in the social and behavioral sciences, including a minimum of 6 semester hours in anthropology, sociology, human relations, or social psychology, or any combination thereof, and

c) 24 semester hours in the professional study of education, including at least 2 semester hours in methods of teaching English as a second language, and a college-supervised student-teaching experience (on any school level except the college level and it need not be in the subject of the license applied for) or the applicant may offer one year of appropriate and satisfactory teaching experience on the elementary school level (Kg-6).

d) Said five years of preparation shall include or be supplemented by at least 12 semester hours in one modern foreign language.

The requirements for both licenses are supported by interpretative notes (some of which have been included in the descriptions given above).

Some comparisons with the original requirements for these same two licenses dated September 16, 1968 are in order.

1. The requirement for "observation and practice teaching" in the original statements stipulated that it shall include

a. Completion of 300 clock hours of observation and supervised practice

teaching, of which at least 150 clock hours shall be in teaching English as a second language in grades Pre-K through 6 for the Day Elementary School License (S.318) (146-68) September 16, 1968, and

b. *6 semester hours in observation and practice teaching in English as a second or foreign language*, in a secondary school, or in an intermediate school, or in grade 7 or 8 of an elementary school for the Junior High and Day High School License (S.331d) 147-68) September 16, 1968.

2. Both original statements concerning work beyond the baccalaureate degree stipulated that 30 semester hours in approved graduate courses be taken.

a. The requirements for the Jr. High and Day High Schools included a note to the effect that the 30 semester hours may be in "The field of the license applied for, or in any other field of general culture, or in the field of education or in any combination of these fields." (S.331d) (147-68) September 16, 1968.

b. The requirements for the Day Elementary Schools stated that the fifth year of preparation shall consist of either 30 semester hours (distributed in the same manner as the current license requirements) or a master's degree related specifically to the teaching of English as a second language.

B. Background of Teachers in the Survey

Questions 1-8, 13, 41, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 40 from the Questionnaire for Teachers (See Appendix-) were used to aid the evaluating team in attempting to define what the average teacher of English as a second language is as he teaches in the school system now.

1. Elementary School Teachers of English as a Second Language

Table 1 indicated the licenses in the New York City School System held by a sample of 76 elementary school teachers from eight different school districts (three in Manhattan, two in the Bronx and three in Brooklyn).

Table 2 lists the responses to questions 2 through 8 and reflects the teachers' teaching experience and classroom situation

Table 2 indicates that though a majority of the teachers have had more than 10 years of experience, a majority of the teachers have less than 4 years of experience in teaching ESL. It further indicates that over 75% of the ESL teachers teach only ESL classes, and that over 90% of the ESL teachers see their students at least once a day, though it is for less than one hour daily in the majority of cases.

TABLE 1: LICENSES HELD – Elementary School Teachers

Item	Responses	
1. What N.Y.C. licenses do you hold?	# of teachers*	% of total (n=76)*
Common Branches	69**	89.7
TESL (Elementary)	25	32.5
TESL (Secondary)	1	1.3
Day Elementary Schools	9	11.7
Early Childhood Education	5***	6.5
H.S. Music	1	1.3
Assistant Principal Day Elementary Schools	1	1.3
Foreign Languages in the Elementary Schedule	1	1.3

* Several teachers held more than one license
** Includes three substitute licenses
*** Includes one substitute license

TABLE 2: CLASSROOM EXPERIENCE - Elementary School Teachers

Item	Time	Responses # of Tchrs. Teaching*	%	b) Teaching ESL	%
2a) How long have you been teaching?	Less than 1 year	1	1.4	11	14.3
	1 to 2 years	4	5.2	37	48.1
b) How long have you been teaching ESL?	3 to 5 years	3	3.9	12	15.6
	5 to 10 years	20	26.0	9	11.7
	more than 10 years	46	59.8	7	9.1

* two teachers did not respond

(continued)

TABLE 2: CLASSROOM EXPERIENCE - Elementary School Teachers (Cont.)

	# of classes	3. ESL*	%	4. Non-ESL*	%
34. How many different classes do you teach daily	0	–		59	76.7
	1-3	5	6.5	14	18.2
	4-6	62	84.5	2	2.6
	7 or more	8	10.4		

* One teacher did not respond

5. How many periods do you see your ESL classes weekly.	less than 5	5	6.5
	5	54	70.2
	6 to 10	7	9.1
	11 to 10	6	7.8
	more than 15	3	3.9

6. How long is each ESL period	20 minutes	1	1.3
	30-40 minutes	20	26.0
	45 minutes	54	70.2
	60 minutes	1	1.3

Responses to question 7 concerning whether or not the teacher taught their ESL classes other subjects indicated that almost 85% did not, while the remaining group indicated that they integrated other subject matter in the course of their ESL lessons.

Over 92% of the teachers indicated in response to question 8 that they used the audio-lingual approach as their classroom methodology, while 26% indicated that they used the direct approach either in lieu of or in addition to the audio-lingual. Less than 3% said they employed the grammar-translation method. The evaluators were forced to question whether some teachers understand what is meant by the audio-lingual approach since 18% indicated that they taught reading in addition to using the audio-lingual approach, which in fact, includes reading as part of the sequence of skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing).

More than three-fourths of the teachers said that they had become involved in teaching ESL as a result of their interest whereas the others indicated that they had been assigned to the job.

Question 31 was concerned with the teachers' university training and their responses can be seen in Table 3.

TABLE 3 – UNIVERSITY TRAINING - Elementary School Teachers

Item 31 — Responses

Degree Held	# Teachers (n = 76)
A.B.	48
B.S.	19
B.F.A.	1
B.Ed.	1
B.B.A.	1
M.S.	11
M.Ed.	1
M.A.	20
No data given	3

Specialization	# Teachers (n = 76)			
	Bachelor's		Master's	
	Major	Minor	Major	Minor
Education	26	10	25	1
Sociology	5	2	–	–
History	5	4	–	–
French	5	4	1	–
Soc. Studies Ed.	4	2	–	–
English	3	11	–	–
Spanish	2	3	–	–
TESOL	–	–	1	1
Other	18 (14 Diff.)	13	5	1

Table 3 indicates the wide diversity of specialization in university training received by the seventy-six TESLS in the sample. It should be noted that of the eighteen majors listed under other, only four appeared twice. The others each appeared once each and ranged from Home Economics to Political Science, from TV/Radio to Latin, through Reading, Speech, C.R.M.D., various languages, sciences, social sciences, accounting and business administration.

In-service courses and attendance at NDEA Institutes and Consortia were surveyed in questions 32 and 33, which are tabulated in Table 4.

TABLE 4: SPECIAL TRAINING – Elementary School Teachers

Item		# attended	Response # teachers	%
32	Attendance at ESL NDEA Institutes or Consortia	0	56	72.8
		1	18	23.4
		2	1	1.3
		3	1	1.3
33	Attendance at ESL In-Service Courses	0	36	46.8
		1	26	33.8
		2	9	11.7
		3	4	5.2
		4	1	1.3

Unsurprising, in view of the limited number of places available in each NDEA Institute, is the number of teachers who have never attended one, 72.8% as seen in Table 4. By the same token, it is surprising that 23.4% of the teachers surveyed indicated that they had attended one of the NDEA Instituest (Teacher's Colleg, N.Y.U.) or the Consortia (sponsored by five different colleges in the Metropolitan area.) It was also surprising, however, to find that more than 46% of the teachers surveyed had never taken an in-service course while less than 20% had taken more than one.

Information concerning specific courses which the teachers surveyed had taken or would be interested in was sought in questions 34 and 40 and can be found in Table 5.

TABLE 5: SPECIFIC COURSES – Elementary School Teachers

Item	Course	Response # credits	# teachers	Combined Percentage
34	a. TESL	9–	1	
		6–	3	35.1%
		4–	2	7.8*
		3–	16	42.9
		2–	5	
	b. Introductory	6	1	18.2%
	Linguistics	3	9	7.8*
		2	4	26.0
	c. Phonology/	8	1	
	Phonetics	6	1	15.6%
		3	7	7.8*
		2	3	23.4
	d. Contrastive	6	1	10.4
	Linguistics	3	5	7.8*
		2	2	18.2
	e. English	8	1	
	Grammatical	6	1	13.0
	Structures	3	7	7.8*
		2	1	20.8
	f. Transformational	3	2	2.6
	Generative			7.8*
	Grammar			10.4
	g. Other	3	3	9.1
	English Usage	3	1	
	P. R. Children	2	3	
	None of above	0	31	40.3

*Assuming In addition, the 6 teachers who attended Institutes where they received courses combining several of the above (5 teachers - 8 credits, 1 teacher - 6 credits)

(continued)

TABLE 5: SPECIFIC COURSES – Elem. Schl. Tchrs. - (continued)

Item					Response	
40	What additional ESL training would you like to have?					
					# teachers	%
a.	Additional lectures					
	on	1)		ESL	42	54.6
		2)		Linguistics	46	59.8
		3)		English Grammar	19	24.7
		4)	a)	Other - Use of Audio - Visual Materials	1	1.3
			b)	Contrastive Linguistics	1	1.3
b.	periodic formal seminars				45	58.5
c.	informal discussion groups				53	68.9
d.	other	1)		Demonstration lessons	3	3.9
		2)		Visit successful programs	3	3.9
		3)		"Refresher" Courses	2	2.6
		4)		Central Resource Room	1	1.3
e.	None Indicated				4	5.2

Despite the fact that over 40% of the teachers had taken none of the courses indicated on the original checklist by the evaluation team, more than 54% indicated an interest in (additional) ESL (54.6%) and Linguistics (59.8%) courses and 58.5% and 68.9% in periodic formal seminars and informal discussion groups, respectively. However, over 75% were not interested in an (additional) course in English grammar.

2. Secondary School Teachers of English as a Second Language

Table 6 indicated the licenses held in the New York City school system held by a sample of 16 secondary school teachers from six different school districts, (three in Brooklyn, two in Manhattan and one in the Bronx).

TABLE 6: LICENSES HELD – Secondary School Teachers

Item		Responses	
1.	What NYC licenses do you hold?	# of Teachers	% of Total (n=16)
	JHS English	4	24.8
	TESL - Secondary Schools	4	24.8
	TESL - Elementary	1	6.2
	Spanish - JHS	4	24.8
	French - JHS	2	12.4
	French - HS	1	6.2
	Spanish - HS	3	18.6
	Social Studies	2	12.4
	Common Branches	3	18.6
	Day Elementary Schools	1	6.2
	Early Childhood Education	1	6.2

The responses to questions 2 through 8 can be found in Table 7 and relate to the teachers' experience in the classroom.

TABLE 7: CLASSROOM EXPERIENCE - Secondary School Teachers

Item	Time	Responses: # of Teachers			
		Time a) Teaching	%	Time b) Teaching ESL	%
2.	Less than 1 year	0		1	6.2
	1 to 2 years	6	37.2	10	62.0
	3 to 5 years	4	24.8	2	12.4
	5 to 10 years	3	18.6	1	6.2
	more than 10 years	3	18.6	2	12.4

		# of Teachers				
		# of classes	3. ESL	%	4. Non-ESL	%
3.4	Number of different classes taught daily:	0	1	6.2	8	49.6
		1-2	11	68.2	7	43.4
		3-4	4	24.8	1	6.2

(continued)

TABLE 7: CLASSROOM EXPERIENCE - Secondary School Teachers (Cont.)

6. How long is each ESL period?

	# of Teachers	%
35-40 minutes	11	68.2
45 minutes	5	31.0

5. How many periods do you see your ESL classes daily?

# periods	# of Teachers	%
1	4	24.8
2	2	12.4
3	6	37.2
4	2	12.4
5	2	12.4

Although 63% of the secondary school teachers have three or more years of experience, 68% have less than three years of experience in teaching ESL. Furthermore, almost 50% of the teachers teach only ESL classes with 43.4% teaching only one or two non-ESL classes. All of the ESL secondary school teachers surveyed met with their ESL students for at least one hour daily with 75% of them seeing the ESL students at least twice a day.

Sixty-nine percent of the teachers indicated, in response to question 7, that they did not teach their ESL students other subjects.

All of the secondary school teachers use the audio-lingual approach as their classroom methology, in responding to question 8.

More than sixty percent of the teachers indicated that they had become involved in teaching ESL as a result of their interest while only 12% said that they had been assigned to the position, the remainder having been asked if they would like to do so.

The teachers' university training was queried in question 31 and the responses can be found in Table 8, which indicates strong interest in language study (over 80%).

TABLE 8: UNIVERSITY TRAINING - Secondary School Teachers

		Responses
Item	Degrees Held	# of teachers (n=16)
31	A.B.	14
	B.S.	2
	M.A.	7*
	M.S.	1

(continued)

TABLE 8: UNIVERSITY TRAINING - Secondary School Teachers (Cont.)

* 6 more expected in 1971.

Specialization	Bachelor's		Master's	
	Major	Minor	Major	Minor
English	3	–	3	–
Languages	10	–	2	–
Education	–	9	–	5
Social Services	3	–	2	–
Early Childhood Ed.	–	–	1	–

Attendance at NDEA Institutes and in-service courses were tabulated in Table 9 and indicate that 31% of the teachers had attended an NDEA Institute, while 80% had never attended an in-service course.

TABLE 9: SPECIAL TRAINING - Secondary School Teachers

Item		Response # attended	Response # of teachers	Response %
32	Attendance at ESL NDEA	0	11	68.2
	Institutes or Consortia	1	5	31.0
33	Attendance at ESL	0	13	80.6
	In-service courses	1	1	6.2
		2	0	0.0
		3	2	12.6

Questions 34 through 40 sought information about specific courses the teachers had taken or would be interested in and is listed in Table 10. Only 24% of the teachers had had no course work in ESL or related courses. Half of the teachers had taken university courses in both ESL and introductory linguistics (Item No. 34) and the other half evinced an interest in doing so (Item No. 40). Almost a quarter of the teachers indicated no interest in any further course work or study.

TABLE 10: SPECIFIC COURSES - Secondary School Teachers

Item	Course	Response # credits	# teachers	combined %
34	a. TESL	9	1	50.0
		6	2	
		3	5	
	b. Introductory Linguistics	6	2	50.0
		3	6	
	c. Phonology/Phonetics	3	6	37.2
	d. Contrastive Linguistics	3	1	6.2
	e. English Grammatical Structs.	8	1	
		6	1	31.0
		3	3	
	f. Transform/Gener. Grammar	3	2	12.4
	g. Other - Language Lab.	2	1	6.2
	None of Above	0	4	24.8

Item		Response # of Teachers	%
40	What additional ESL training would you like?		
	a. Addition lectures on:		
	1) ESL	7	43.4
	2) Linquistics	7	43.4
	3) English Grammar	3	18.6
	4) Other - ESL Resources, Materials	1	6.2
	b. Periodic formal seminars	9	55.8
	c. Informal discussion groups	9	55.8
	d. Other: 1) Demonstration Lessons	1	6.2
	2) Institute: ESL Technology	1	6.2
	3) ESL Approach-subject areas	1	6.2
	e. None indicated	4	24.8

C. In the Classroom

1. Elementary School Teachers

Questions 8, 10-13, 21-23, 35, 36, and 37-39 were designed to find out more about the teacher, and her classroom situation.

Questions 35 and 36 asked whether teachers were members of the national progression organization, T.E.S.O.L. (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages) and whether they had attended any of the annual conventions.

Table 11 indicates the teachers' responses to these questions.

TABLE 11: MEMBERSHIP IN T.E.S.O.L. – Elementary School

Item			# of teachers	%
35	Are you a member of T.E.S.O.L.?	Yes	22	28.6
		No	54	71.4
36	Have you attended any of the conventions?	Yes	15	20.7
		No	61	79.3
	Where? San Francisco (1970)		0	
	Chicago (1969)		2	
	San Antonio (1968)		1	
	Miami (1967)		2	
	New York (1966)		14	

Only 28.6% of the teachers surveyed indicated that they were members of T.E.S.O.L. and fewer had attended any of the national conventions (20.7%) with a majority having attended only the organizing convention of the organization in New York four years ago.

In response to question 8 (characterize your classroom methodology), 92% of the teachers indicated that they employed an audio-lingual approach, some also indicating that

they used some techniques of the direct approach. Some questions remained as to the teachers' understanding of what is meant by the audio-lingual approach, however, since 18% indicated under other that they also taught reading and/or writing, which should be, in fact, integral parts of the audio-lingual approach (See Wilga Rivers' *Teaching Foreign Language Skills*. U. of Chicago Press, 1968, p. 53f.)

Questions 10 and 11 asked the teachers to indicate their perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of the ESL programs at their schools. Responses can be found in Table 12, which indicates that the nature of the ESL approach and the small class size are considered the major strengths of the programs, while the major needs include more teachers, more or better materials and classroom space and more time for ESL classes.

TABLE 12: ESL–PROGRAM STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES–Elementary School

Item		# OF TEACHERS*	%
10	What is the greatest strength of the ESL Program at your school?		
	The nature of ESL–gradation, drills . . .	25	32.5
	Small groups: tchr-student rapport	28	36.4
	Daily contact with students	8	10.4
	Cooperation of the Administration	9	11.7
	Other	11	14.3
	None Listed	1	1.3
11	What is the most glaring need of the ESL Program at your school?		
	More class time	11	14.3
	More or better classroom space	15	19.5
	More or better materials	23	29.9
	More TESLs	36	46.8
	Other	2	2.6
	None Listed	4	5.2

* Some teachers indicated more than one in each question. The percentage is of the total n (76).

Question 12 was concerned with whether educational assistants were available to the teachers who responded to the questionnaire and how they would evaluate such aids (See Table 13)

TABLE 13: EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANTS–Elementary Schools

Item			# OF TEACHERS	%
12	a) Do you have any personnel to assist you in the ESL classroom?	Yes	11*	14.3
		No	65	85.7
	Paraprofessional		3	
	Teaching Assistant		1	
	Bilingual Professional Assistant		8	
	b) How effectively does this person perform?			
	Very effective		6	
	Effective		3	
	Adequate		2	
	Poor		–	

*One teacher had two different aids.

The 11 teachers who said that they had the assistance of an educational aid indicated that such aids were functioning effectively.

More than 70% of the teachers indicated, in response to question 13, that they had become involved in teaching ESL as a result of their interest, while less than 23% indicated that they had been assigned to teach ESL by their respective principals.

In response to whether they thought their ESL classes successful (Question 37) 93% responded yes, 4% no, and 3% did not respond at all.

Responses to questions 38 and 39 concerned classroom supervision and aid, and can be found in Table 14.

TABLE 14: CLASSROOM SUPERVISION–Elementary Schools

Item		# of visits	# of Teachers: 3 or less	4 to 6	more than 6
38a	How often are you visited in your classroom during the school year by:				
	1.	D.C.E.S.L.	31	21	14
	2.	Board Consultant	6	2	–
	3.	Other TESL	14	5	1
	4.	Dept. Chairman or Ass't. Principal	6	1	1

38b Please rate the quality of cooperation and guidance you received from each

	EXCELLENT	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	VERY POOR
1. D.C.E.S.L.	50	16	1	–	1
2. Board Consultant	8	3	–	–	–
3. Other TESL	5	5	1	2	–
4. Dept. Chrman or A.P.	4	2	–	–	–

39 When you need help with your ESL classes, whom do you ask?

D.C.E.S.L.	50
Other TESL	8
Assistant Principal	8
Principal	3
Board Consultant	1
Other	11
No response	4

Table 14 indicates that in districts that have ESL coordinators, they do the majority of the classroom supervision, occasionally supported by the consultant from the central office, who, on the other hand, takes on the major supervisory role (extra-school) where there is no district coordinator.

The quality of supervision was rated good or excellent by a substantial majority of those surveyed.

In support of the responses to questions 38a and b were the responses to question 39 where 65% of the teachers indicated that they contact the DCESL when help is needed. Under "other," responses included bilingual "teacher," university professors, and two respondents who felt there was "no one to ask."

Questions 21 through 23 (See Appendix A) were concerned with audio-visual materials. Most of the materials listed in question 21 were available at every school with the exception of a language laboratory which was available in only one of the districts surveyed. In addition such aids as phonographs, overhead projectors and radios were listed by the teachers.

In response to question 22, it was apparent that though many of the materials were "available" at the schools, the TESLs had, at times, great difficulty getting them either because they were shared by too many or because the space which they were allotted was insufficient for using some of the materials. Many teachers indicated that they would like exclusive use of tape recorders and phonographs.

The teachers' responses to question 23, concerning which audio-visual materials they found most useful, included all of the materials listed for them in question 21 with specific mention of realia, pictures, puppets, phonographs and overhead projectors as well.

These observations about Audio-Visual materials also apply to the Secondary School teachers, whose classroom situation is described below.

2. Secondary School Teachers

Only 25% of the Secondary teachers surveyed were members of TESOL, the national professional organization, and only one teacher had attended the organizing convention in New York City four years ago. (See Table 15)

TABLE 15: MEMBERSHIP IN T.E.S.O.L. - Secondary School

Item			# of teachers	%
35	Are you a member of T.E.S.O.L.?	Yes	4	25.0
		No	12	75.0
36	Have you attended any of the conventions?	Yes	1	6.2
		No	15	93.8
	Where? New York City (1966)		1	

Teachers' perceptions of the strengths and needs of the ESL programs in their schools suggest their satisfaction with the ESL approach, teacher teamwork and small class size, while they would like to see more teachers, materials, space and ESL materials designed for subject areas, as indicated in Table 16.

TABLE 16: ESL-PROGRAM STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES–Secondary School

Item		# of Teachers	%
10	What is the greatest strength of the ESL program at your school?		
	The nature of ESL-gradation, drills . . .	5	31.0
	Teacher Teamwork	6	37.2
	Small Class size	3	18.6
	Other	3	18.6
11	What is the most glaring need of the ESL program at your school?		
	More TESLs	6	37.2
	More materials	6	37.2
	More space	2	12.4
	ESL materials for other subject areas	3	18.6

Whether any educational assistants were available to the teachers surveyed and the quality of such assistance were the subjects of question 12, the responses to which indicated that 50% of the teachers did have such aid and that 75% of those who did found their assistants to be very effective. (See Table 17)

TABLE 17: EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANTS – Secondary Schools

Item			# of Teachers	%
12	a) Do you have any personnel to assist you in the ESL classroom?	Yes	8	50.0
		No	8	50.0
	Paraprofessional		4*	
	Teaching Assistant		–	
	Bilingual Professional Assistant		5	

* two different paraprofessionals listed by one teacher

b)	How effectively does this person perform?		
	Very effective	6	
	Effective	1	
	Adequate		
	Poor	1	

One teacher indicated it was too soon to evaluate a new educational assistant.

As with the elementary school teachers, the secondary school teachers received the major part of their supervision from the DCESL, and rated it either excellent or good, as can be seen in Table 4.

Unlike the elementary school, however, most of the secondary school teachers surveyed had an ESL coordinator in the school and were not so dependent on the DCESL for help with problems. (See Table 18)

TABLE 18: CLASSROOM SUPERVISION – Secondary Schools

Item		# of visits	# of Teachers 3 or less	4 to 6	more than 6
38a	How often are you visited in your classroom during the school year by:				
	1. D.C.E.S.L.		8	3	1
	2. Board Consultant		–	–	–
	3. Other T.E.S.L.		4	–	2
	4. Dept. Chairman or Assistant Principal		1	1	2

Two respondents were coordinators of TESL at the school and did not teach.

		EXCELLENT	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	VERY POOR
38b.	Please rate the quality of cooperation and guidance you received from each					
	1. DCESL	6	4			
	2. Board Consultant					
	3. Other TESL	6				
	4. Dept. Chairman or A.P.	2	2			

39	When you need help with your ESL classes, whom do you ask?	
	1. DCESL	5
	2. ESL Coordinator at School	6
	3. Colleagues	2
	4. Dept Chairman	3

D. Teacher Ratings

In order to determine classroom effectiveness, the *Teacher Observation Checklist* (See Appendix B) prepared by the evaluation team during the 1968-69 evaluation was utilized.

Twenty schools were visited in twelve districts. Twenty-three teachers were observed, sixteen at the elementary level and seven at the secondary (intermediate and junior high schools.)

The checklist contains 39 items concerning teacher attitude, methodology, and rapport with students, and 10 items designed to aid the observer in obtaining similar information in terms of student interest, attitude, and understanding.

In addition to the twenty-three observations recorded for this evaluation there were five other observations which were not recorded because too little time had been spent in the classroom for a valid observation to be made (the typical visit was approximately 30 minutes, some longer), usually because the teacher had not expected the visit. All of these teachers welcomed the evaluators to their classes anyway. Visits were set up for the evaluation team through the office of the Assistant Director of English in charge of ESL and bilingual classes. They were then made via that office through the DCESL or directly with the school. Still, as often as not the evaluators were not expected. It must be explained that unfortunately almost all of the visits took place in the wake of the Kent State tragedy and although the schools were functioning, conditions were not "as usual."

The visits scheduled for three high schools were similarly canceled either by telephone or by the Evaluator's discovering upon arriving at the school that he was not expected or that things were in such turmoil that it would be appreciated if the observation were omitted.

This was not the case in one high school where an irate principal indicated that she would have no evaluator use her ESL program as a model to indicate what was happening to the Title I funds when her school had in fact, received none. She, very graciously, however, invited individual members of the Evaluation team to visit her school "to see what a good ESL program looks like" provided no write-up would appear as part of this evaluation.

Table 19 shows the results of the evaluation based on a rating system of 4, 3, 2, 1, 0 (from excellent to unacceptable, with space allotted for not applicable (N/A) since one could not expect to see every item covered in every class. Items rated N/A were not counted in the ratings which were achieved by multiplying the number of checks in each category and dividing by the total number of applicable items.

TABLE 19: TEACHER RATINGS – Elementary and Secondary

	Scores			
	Elementary		Secondary	
Tchr	Teacher (39 items)	Student (10 Items)	Teacher	Student
1	3.90	3.10	2.86	3.75
2	3.50	1.75	2.79	3,70
2	3.38	3.37	2.68	3.22
4	3.26	3.83	2.66	3.50
5	3.09	2.70	1.50	2.22
6	3.00	3.67	1.45	3.00
7	2.82	2.88	0.62	0.00
8	2.65	2.60		
9	2.63	2.55		
10	2.60	2.80		
11	2.59	2.89		
12	2.23	2.55		
13	1.88	1.90		
14	1.73	3.33		
15	1.36	1.60		
16	1.12	1.00		
Avg.	2.60	2.65	2.08	2.77

Though correlations between "Teacher" items and "student" items in raw scores are rather high, it can be seen in Table 19 that a good teacher can be performing well with a class which is not making obvious progress (Tchr 2, Elementary), and a teacher can be doing a relatively poor job with a class that is apparently responding well (Tchr 14, Elementary; Tchr 6, Secondary).

The elementary school teachers as a group on this rating system, are doing a better than acceptable job (2.60) with 37.5% doing a good to excellent job (3.0-3.9), another 37.5% doing an acceptable to good job, with only 25% being considered poor.

The secondary school teachers did not score as well. Here, the much smaller sample inflates the meaning of the data out of proportion so that they become almost meaningless in terms of suggesting generalizations.

E. Miscellaneous Observations:

1. One elementary school lesson was terminated when class was forced to leave its cafeteria setting (teacher carries all audio/visual materials) because a group was to be using the cafeteria for testing for the More Effective Schools Program.

2. At two secondary schools, the evaluator was told by the principal that there were 1 and 6 TESL's for 1050 and 1650 students respectively. Both principals were pleased with what could be done based on the TESLs they had but wanted more and said that they could not get them.

3. In one junior high class, the outstanding progress of the students, recent arrivals, can be attributed to the fifteen (15) contact-ESL classes per week.

4. One ESL teacher was said to have a "heavy" foreign accent.

5. Two different evaluators questioned the fact that (a) an eighth grade group, during the first week in June, was still "learning" such elementary patterns as *The ball is red/blue/green/brown. The ball is in the box/on the box.*

(b) an elementary grade class, during the first week in June, was still "learning" and still did not have control over *What's this? This is a* --- . This was especially disconcerting because the students were still using *this* in their responses (with realia) when they should have been using *that.*

6. A junior high school class had three illiterate students of nil English proficiency in the same class with students who were well on their way to becoming bilingual. Though other examples of this kind of poor placement were not so extreme, it was obvious to the evaluators that new procedures are needed to obtain more homogeneous grouping based on English proficiency in ESL classes.

7. One evaluator was scheduled by the Central Board office to visit a school where there was no TESL. He was prevented from making the trip inadvertently when he happened to speak to the DCESL a few days prior to the scheduled visit, which was then re-scheduled for another school.

F. TESLs Assigned under Title I

Information was made available to the evaluation team on the assignment of thirty-one of the thirty-five new TESL's funded under Title I (Function No. 933653), and assigned to thirteen different districts in Manhattan, Brooklyn and the Bronx, and two high schools in Manhattan. Pertinent personal data was obtained for sixteen of the thirty-one and they appear in Table 20.

TABLE 20: TESLS – Funded under Title I

	# of teachers	%
1. Number of years teaching ESL:		
1 or less	8	50.0%
2	4	25.0%
3 to 5	2	12.5%
10 to 11	2	12.5%
2. Holder of TESL License		
Yes	4	25.0%
No	12	75.0%
3. Number of credits in TESL and linguistics courses:		
0	7	43.3%
1-3	3	18.6%
6-9	4	24.8%
14-16	2	12.4%
4. Number of ESL In-Svc. Courses taken:		
0	10	62.0
1	5	31.0
2	1	6.2
5. Number of NDEA Institutes attended		
0	12	75.0
1	4	25.0

The information contained in Table 20 indicates that of the sixteenTESLs for whom this data was available 75% of them had less than three years of experience teaching ESL; the same percentage did not hold an ESL license (one of the sixteen had two, the elementary and the secondary); almost 44% had had no ESL or linguistics credits while 37.3% had had six or more credits; 62% had never attended an ESL in-service course; and 75% had not attended any NDEA institutes.

CHART 1: THE AVERAGE TESL IN THE SURVEY

Elementary	The Average TESL surveyed has	Secondary
Common Branches	License	TESL or Foreign Language
more than 5 years	Time Teaching	less than 5 years
1 to 2 years	Time Teaching ESL	1 to 2 years
one 45 minute period	ESL Contact classes: daily	2 or more 40 minute periods
Elementary Education	Specialization	Languages (English and foreign)
no	Attendance at NDEA Inst.	no
one or more	Taken in-service courses	none
	Took a course in*	
no (42.9%)	ESL	yes
no (26.0%)	Introductory Linguistics	yes
no (23.4%)	Phonology/Phonetics	no (37.2%)
no (18.2%)	Contrastive Linguistics	no (6.2%)
no (20.8%)	English Grammar	no (31.0%)
no (10.4%)	Transformational Grammar	no (12.4%)
	Wants a course in*	
yes	ESL	yes
yes	Linguistics	yes
no (24.7%)	English Grammar	no (18.6%)
2.60	Had a rating on a scale from 0(unacceptable) to 4(excellent) of **	2.08

* Percentages in parentheses indicate those interested.

** See Table 19, page 26

III. The Merrill and the Miami Linguistic Reader Programs

At the end of the third year of the Merrill and the Miami Linguistic Reading programs, some statistical evidence is now available for the first time.

Aside from the statistical data, however, observations are in order as to the materials themselves.

A. The Miami Linguistic Readers

The Miami readers, as reported in An Evaluation of Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages in the Public Schools, Sept. 1969, consistently continue to provide the student with reading material which

a. closely controls the number of new words per story

b. limits the vowel sounds carefully until all the vowels have been introduced.

c. makes apparently little effort to control the consonant sounds (including clusters) which appear in the words used in the texts

B. The Merrill Linguistic Readers

These readers, as reported in the 1969 evaluation cited above, consistently continue to provide the student with reading material which

a. works tightly within the matrix concept

b. maintains an extremely high sound/symbol correlation until all of the sounds have been introduced

c. controls the introduction of consonant clusters (excepting inflectional endings for plural, possessives and 3rd person singular "s") until all unit consonant letters have been introduced (p. 34 of Book 3).

d. precludes students' having to handle two or more syllable words with the exception of a few "sight words" (into, little, mother, doctor, story, grandma, grandpa, and inflected "es") until p. 32 of Book 4, when the–ing form of words is introduced following the matrix which includes *ring, sing, king, wing* and *thing* on p. 16.

Both the Merrill and the Miami programs are linguistically oriented and they utilize a relatively systematic progression that builds on previously learned material. Since the first step in learning to read is that of learning to de-code, they offer, especially for the non-native speaking student, a solid base from which the learner can develop other reading skills as well.

They both require, however, a sound, consistent ESL approach both as prelude to and in support of them. Unlike native speakers, the non-native must acquire audio-lingual

control before he can be introduced to and be expected to acquire reading skills for the first time.

The statistical data available is limited to those students who have completed the respective projects prior to June 1970, and was made available by Mrs. Evelyn Kleban, Central Board Consultant and Project Coordinator for both the Merrill and the Miami reading programs, who in addition to maintaining monthly contact with each of the individual teachers in the respective programs also provided, for each group, a series of three workshops for all teachers and educational assistants participating in the program. These workshops which included orientation to the philosophy and basic concepts underlying each program, provided demonstration lessons and were also concerned with basic ESL methodology, especially as it applied to these reading programs. Descriptions of the Workshops, offered by Mrs. Kleban can be found in Appendix C.

Tables 21 and 22 indicate the number of children who have been in each project since 1967 or 1968, the number who have completed the project with the range, average, and median scores on the Metropolitan Reading Achievement Test, and the number of children who have not completed the project with an estimate of the time it would take to do so.

TABLE 21: MERRILL LINGUISTIC READING PROJECT*

A. # children in project since September 1967: 47

30 completed project					17 did not complete project		
# Children	As of	Range**	Average	Median	# Children	Completed	Approximate Time Needed
16	3/70	3.8-6.4	5.0	5.2	4	Book 5	3 months
10	5/70	2.6-4.1	3.5	3.7	13	Book 4	6 months
4	6/70	not tested					

B. # children in project since September 1968: 118

6 completed project					112 did not complete project		
6	3/70	2.1-4.4	3.3	3.3	36	Book 4 or 5	3-6 months
					58	Book 3	12 months
					18	Book 1 or 2	unknown

* Data supplied by Board Consultant, Merrill Project Coordinator, Mrs. Evelyn Kleban

** Scores on Metropolitan Reading Achievement Test

TABLE 22: MIAMI LINGUISTIC READING PROJECT*

A. # children in project since September 1967: 131

72 completed project					59 did not complete project		
# Children	As of	Range**	Average**	Median**	# Children	Program Completion	Approximate Time Needed
19	3/70	3.5-7.5	4.6	4.2	45	75%	6 months
15	5/70	2.4-4.1	3.4	3.3	10	50%	12 months
38	6/70	not tested			4	insignificant	unknown

B. # children in project since September 1968: 155

6 completed project					149 did not complete project		
6	3/70	3.0-3.6	3.3	3.3	129	***	6-8 months
					16	***	12 months
					4	***	unknown

* Data supplied by Board Consultant, Miami Project Coordinator, Mrs. Evelyn Kleban

** Scores on Metroplitan Reading Achievement Test

*** Information on program completion was not provided.

More than 63% of the students who have been in the Merril project since its onset have completed it, while more than 55% of those in the Miami program since 1967 have completed it.

The less than 37% who have not yet completed the Merrill would need between 3 and 6 months to do so. In the Miami project, of the 45% who have yet to complete the set of readers, over 80% would need approximately 6 months, with the remainder needing about 1 year, with the exception of four students whose progress has been insignificant.

It is further estimated that 84% of the Merrill students and 97% of the Miami students who began the program during the second year (1968) could complete the program in one year or less.

According to the data accumulated thus far, completing the programs apparently means achieving a relatively satisfactory reading level in terms of city-wide averages and national norms, as can be seen in Tables 23 and 24.

TABLE 23: DISTRICT MEAN READING GRADE SCORES*

District	Grade Two		Grade Three	
	1968	1969	1968	1969
1**	2.3	2.3	3.0	3.0
2	3.0	2.9	3.8	3.7
5	2.6	2.7	3.4	3.4
13	2.5	2.5	3.2	3.1
15	2.3	2.5	3.1	3.1
17	2.5	2.5	3.3	3.2
Citywide	2.7	2.8	3.7	3.5
Norm	2.7	2.7	3.7	3.7

1969 District Means are:

Lower	6 districts	20 districts
Same	15	6
Higher	10	5

* Metropolitan Reading Achievement Test Scores from p. 15 Summary of Citywide Reading Test Results for 1968-1969
Office of Educational Research, 12/1/70. City School District of the City of New New York

** Figures were also used to exemplify correlation between district mean scores and socio-economic status. District 1 representing a "relatively deprived group." Table 6, p. 19, Summary.

TABLE 24: GRADE NORMS: Metropolitan Reading Achievement Test Scores

Month, Year	At or above Grade Norm (%)			
	Grade Two		Grade Three	
	Word Knowledge	Paragraph Meaning	Word Knowledge	Paragraph Meaning
April, 1969	45.6	44.7	39.5	39.4*
1968	44.6	45.2	42.0	44.0*
1967	45.9	45.1	39.4	40.1**
Grade Norms	2.7		3.7	

* p. 23-24 Summary of Citywide Reading Test Results for 1968-1969.

** P. 13-14 Summary of Citywide Reading Test Results for 1966-1967.
Office of Educational Research – Board of Education of the City of New York

(It must be understood that these grades may not be directly comparable because of the differences in dates at which the tests were administered. Nevertheless, they provide a valid basis for comparison.)

Table 24 indicates that only 45.6% of second grade students and 39.5% of third grade students read at or above the nationwide grade norms (In "Word Knowledge") according to the latest summary available from the office of Education Research of the City School District of the City of New York.

Table 23 indicates the mean reading grade scores for the Districts in which the Merrill (13, 15, 17) and Miami (1, 2, 5) projects took place.

The six children who completed each program after only a two year period are certainly above the norms for the second grade at average scores of 3.3 for each group.

Similarly the three-year students who have completed the program are reading at or near grade level, a feat unmatched by the total average scores for the districts in which they reside.

If these grades accurately reflect ability, then the students in these two projects are reading at the same level as or better than approximately 55% of all second grade students and 60% of all third grade students. These are not unimpressive figures for students whose native language is not English.

IV. STUDENTS: LANGUAGE, PLACEMENT, EVALUATION

Students, their placement and English proficiency, were the subject of questions 24 through 30.

Because of a misunderstanding caused by the lack of clarity of question 24, the teachers' responses varied from the actual numbers of students in each class (the desired response), to percentages, to check-marks to indicate the presence of students of the language group in their classes. See Table 25, which includes all of the students indicated numerically, only. The pattern of class make-up for the remainder is totally parallel to that indicated in the table.

TABLE 25: STUDENT MAKE-UP – Elementary Schools

Item 24

Native Language	# of Students
1) Native English	44
2) Non-Native	
a. Spanish	2158
b. Chinese	49
c. French	38
d. Pakistani	2
e. Hebrew	1
f. Korean	3
g. Iranian	1
h. Indian	2
i. Italian	4
j. Greek	24
k. Albanian	4
l. Yugoslavian	13
m. Polish	1
n. Dutch	2
o. German	1
p. Hungarian	3
q. Arabic	1
	2351

More than 90% of the ESL students in the eight districts surveyed were native speakers of Spanish. No explanatory data was offered, or in fact requested as part of the questionnaire, concerning the 44 native English speaking students and whether they were in ESL groups.

Questions 24 through 28 were concerned with the placement and evaluation of non-native speaking students, the responses to which can be found in Table 26.

TABLE 26: STUDENT PLACEMENT AND EVALUATION – Elementary Schools

Item		# of teachers	%
25	On what basis are students placed in your ESL classes?		
a.	Written Test	4	5.2
b.	Oral Test	36	46.8
c.	Interview	58	75.4
d.	I do not know	-	
e.	Other – Tchr* Recom.	23	29.9
26	If an interview is used, who conducts it?		
a.	TESL	35	45.5
b.	Bilingual Tchr	13	16.9
c.	Conference (a b . . .)	21	27.3
d.	Teacher*	3	3.9
e.	Others	6	7.8
27	Do you use the Board English Language Rating Scale?		
	Yes	75	98.7
	No	1	1.3
28	How is student's English proficiency measured at end of semester?	#	%
	Written test for ESL students	5	6.5
	Written test for all students	2	2.6
	Oral Test	41	53.3
	Teacher's Evaluation	75	98.7
	Other	2	2.6

* Indicates regular classroom teacher, not TESL

Several teachers checked more than one choice resulting in seemingly inflated figures. Nevertheless more than 75% of the ESL students in the surveyed group are placed on the basis of an interview, often supported by an oral test (46.8%).

When an interview is conducted, more than 45% are conducted by the TESL often in conjunction with the Bilingual Teacher for Community Affairs (not a classroom teacher).

Almost all (98.7%) of the teachers use the Board English language Rating Scale and the same percentage indicated that the teacher's evaluation is the most frequent source for measuring students' English language proficiency at the end of the semester, supported by an oral test in more than 53% of the teachers responding.

Questions 29 and 30 proved invalid for use in the elementary schools where all of the students apparently attend ESL classes only on a pull-out basis from their regular class. In other words, they are always in the mainstream and are removed solely for the ESL class of 30 to 45 minutes.

The secondary-school-teacher responses to question 24 through 28 paralleled those of the elementary school teachers as to the linguistic makeup of their classes being predominantly Spanish-speaking, except for two teachers in the same district in Brooklyn where the predominant group spoke French.

Similarly placement in ESL classes was based almost completely on an interview which was, however, conducted primarily by the ESL coordinator at each school rather than by the TESL herself.

About 80% of the secondary school teachers used the Board of Education English language Rating Scale and all of the teachers indicated that the students' English proficiency was measured by the TESLs' evaluations at the end of the semester. Almost 50% of the teachers use a written test designed for ESL students, prepared by the teachers.

The responses to question 29, which were not incorporated into the data for Elementary school teachers because most of the students are in the mainstream but are "pulled-out" for ESL classes, indicated that the TESLs and/or the Coordinator of ESL at the individual school decided when a student was ready to join the mainstream. The question concerning the basis for this decision (question 30) received no response from any of the teachers.

V. CURRICULUM ARTICULATIOR

Table X indicates the annual pupil mobility in the New York City schools during the five year period from 1962-63 to 1966-67. Though specific data were not available on the mobility of non-native speaking students, questioning of any principal in areas with large numbers of non-native children will tell you that mobility is high, as high as 50% during a single school year.

Mobility is a crucial factor in the consideration of coordinated curricula in the City's school system, which is the subject of this section of the evaluation. What is the likelihood that a child will be able to pick up where he left off last year, let alone last week as is often the case?

TABLE 27: ANNUAL PUPIL MOBILITY IN NEW YORK CITY SCHOOLS 1962-1967*

		Transfers Within New York City			Pupil Migration	
School Year	Total Pupil Register	Within Borough Transfers	Between Borough Transfers	Total Transfers	Into the City	Out of the City
1962-63	1,027,426	69,843	27,070	96,913	39,171	42,317
1963-64	1,045,554	78,112	28,466	106,578	39,661	41,681
1964-65	1,054,201	86,963	31,184	118,147	39,318	43,151
1965-66	1,065,920	90,906	30,211	121,117	42,771	46,462
1966-67	1,084,818	90,475	29,048	119,523	46,379	47,351

* p. 4 Table 2, Summary of Citywide Reading Test Results for 1968-1969

Questions 14 through 20 on the Questionnaire for teachers were designed to elicit information concerning the textbooks utilized at various grade levels, in different schools, in the same and different districts, who selected the texts and what selections individual teachers might recommend given a choice.

A Elementary School Teachers

Table 27 indicates the textbooks used by both teacher and students in the elementary schools, but is limited to those books used by a total of at least five teachers in at least two different districts.

TABLE 28: SUMMARY OF TEXTBOOKS USED – Elementary Schools

Item 14 / Text*	# of teachers — District								Teacher Totals — Grades			
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	K-2	3-4	5-6	All
1.**	1	3	6	3	–	–	3	–	1	6	4	5
2.**	4	10	1	–	1	2	5	2	7	8	5	5
3.	2	–	2	4	–	–	3	2	–	4	8	1
4.**	3	–	1	6	–	–	2	–	–	3	7	2
5.	4	–	–	1	–	4	1	–	–	4	5	1
6.	–	–	3	3	1	1	3	2	3	2	1	7
7.**	–	–	1	2	–	–	2	–	1	1	2	1
8.**	–	–	–	4	1	–	–	–	2	–	3	–
No Texts	2	8	5	4	–	6	–	1				26
Non-ESL Texts	24	9	3	–	2	–	–	–	11	12	10	5

All or Undesignated Grades

* See appendix D for Author and Title of text which corresponds to these numbers.

** Indicates a series which could be expected to be used at different levels (2 or more volumes)

In addition to the eight texts (or series) listed in Table 28, there were eleven other texts (or series) indicated by various teachers. Among the books listed was one intended for use with adult or secondary school students.

To the extent that a child might move within the eight districts listed in Table Y, he would have a fairly good chance of finding the same textbook in use. However, at the same time, he might find himself being asked to learn from the same book he had already completed or from a book which extends in terms of English proficiency beyond what he had already been exposed to.

One of the problems with the information received in response to question 14 is that some teachers responded strictly in terms of grade level whereas others indicated by their responses that they were responding in terms of proficiency levels. Others did not indicate any kind of level and that is the reason for the "all or undesignated" column in Table 28.

Table 29 charts the responses to question 15 which asked teachers to indicate what texts they used as source or reference materials. The table once again includes only those

texts listed by at least five teachers in at least two different districts. This information indicates which texts were used by many of those teachers who did not use texts in class with students.

TABLE 29: TEACHER SOURCE AND REFERENCE TEXTS – Elementary Schools

Item 15

Text*	# of teachers / District								Teacher Totals
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	
1.	–	–	2	–	–	–	–	–	2
2.	1	4	3	–	–	–	–	–	8
3.	–	7	1	1	–	1	–	–	10
4.	7	1	3	1	1	1	–	–	14
5.	–	–	–	1	–	1	–	–	2
6.	8	7	4	5	–	5	6	1	36
7.	–	2	1	1	–	–	–	–	4
8.	1	–	–	2	–	–	1		4
9.	7	14	–	1	–	4	6	–	32
10.	4	–	1	–	–	1	–	–	6
11.	1	1	2	1	–	–	2	–	7
12.	2	2	3	–	3	3	1	–	14
13.	–	7	1	–	3	1	1	–	13
14.	–	1	2	–	–	2	–	–	5
15.	–	1	1	3	–	–	–	–	5
16.	5	7	7	5	–	2	–	–	26

* See appendix D for Author and Title of text which corresponds to these numbers.

In addition to those listed in Table 29, thirty-three other texts were listed by teachers, nineteen of them by only one teacher each. Ten of the thirty-three fell into the category of strictly teacher reference while the remainder were texts which might be used by non-English speaking children in the classroom as well.

The same numbers used in Table 28 were also used in Table 29 and that is the reason for the inclusion of four texts (No. 1, 5, 7, 8) which were used by fewer than five teachers.

Two of the most frequently used texts were a textbook on ESL methodology (No. 16) and the *Handbook for Language Arts*, Pre-K-2 (No. 9). The other (No. 6) was a text designed for use with very young children and which was probably used by most of the teachers who responded "no text" to question 14.

Question twenty asked teachers to list the textbook they would select for each class they teach, if the choice were theirs. Over 36% of the teachers indicated that they would continue to use the same texts as they were already using (See Table 30) while only five books were selected by teachers in more than one district; one of these books is a new series (including a kit) which had received a lot of pre-publication publicity (No. 18). Those texts listed in responses to questions 14 (table 28) and 15 (Table 29) which were not chosen by any teachers were omitted from Table 30 for conciseness.

TABLE 30: TEXTS – TEACHER CHOICE – Elementary School

Item 20 Text*	# of Teachers by District								Teacher Totals
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	
1.	–	–	–	1	–	1	–	–	2
2.	–	8	–	–	–	–	–	–	8
4.	–	–	–	–	–	2	1	–	3
5.	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1
6.	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	1
8.	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	1
10.	–	14	–	–	–	–	–	–	14
13.	–	–	–	1	–	–	1	–	2
14.	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	1
17.	2	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	3
18.	–	4	1	2	–	–	–	–	8
Same Text	6	8	–	5	3	6	–	–	28

* See appendix D for Author and Title of text which corresponds to these numbers.

Table 31 indicates the teachers' responses to questions 16 through 19 which asked about who selected texts and the basis on which selection was made. In 42.9% of the cases, the teacher (TESL) made the selection.

The responses to question 17 were unproductive as more than 70% of the teachers did not respond.

Approximately half of the teachers were consulted as to the texts they would use (48%), while, of those responding in the affirmative to this question, more than 50% indicated that the District Coordinator of ESL (D.C.E.S.L.) prepared the list.

TABLE 31: TEXTBOOK SELECTION – Elementary Schools

Item		# of Teachers by District A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Teacher Total	%
16	Selector										
	Previous Teacher	2	2	1	3	1	–	–	–	9	11.7
	D.C.E.S.L.	–	1	3	–	2	–	4	–	10	13.0
	TESL	4	8	7	4	1	5	3	1	33	42.9
	Assistant Principal	1	4	–	–	–	1	–	–	6	7.8
	No Response	1	4	1	4	–	4	–	1	15	19.5
	Other	1	–	–	–	–	–	2	–	3	3.9
17	Basis for selection										%
	Need	1	3	1	2	–	3	–	–	10	13.0
	Availability	1	5	1	2	–	2	–	1	12	15.6
	No Response	6	8	7	6	4	5	10	1	47	71.1
	Other	1	3	3	–	–	–	–	–	7	9.1
18	Was teacher consulted?										
	Yes	5	10	4	3	2	4	7	1	36	48.0
	No	4	9	8	7	2	6	3	1	40	52.0
19	Who prepared list?										
	D.C.E.S.L.	4	2	3	–	2	1	5	–	17	
	Bd. of Ed.	–	2	1	2	–	–	1	1	7	
	Other	1	4	1	–	–	2	1	–	9	

B. SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS

Table 32 indicates that of the eight texts (or series) used in two or more districts in the limited survey of secondary schools, four of them were also used at the elementary levels. Only six texts were indicated that do not appear in the table; each was used by only one teacher.

TABLE 32: SUMMARY OF TEXTBOOKS – Secondary Schools

Item 14: Textbooks Used

	# of Teachers District									Teacher Totals Grades			
Text*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	5-6	7	8	9
3	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	–	1	1	–	2	–
4	1	–	1	–	–	3	1	–	–	2	2	2	–
5	–	1	–	–	–	2	–	–	–	2	1	–	–
7	1	–	–	–	–	2	–	–	1	–	3	1	–
13	3	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	1	1	2
19	1	–	1	–	–	1	–	–	–	1	1	1	–
20	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	1	1	–
21	–	–	–	–	–	1	1	–	1	–	2	1	–

Fourteen other books were listed, none are used in more than one of the districts surveyed.

* See Appendix D for Author and title of text which corresponds to these numoers.

Although twenty-three different texts were listed as teacher sources or reference, not one was listed by more than one teacher, in response to question 15.

All sixteen teachers indicated that they would select the same texts that they are currently using, in response to question 20.

The ESL coordinator at the school selects the textbooks in 43% of the responses to question 16, while 86% did not respond to a query as to the basis for textbook selection, and 62% had not been consulted. See Table 33.

TABLE 33: TEXTBOOK SELECTION – Secondary Schools

Item		# of Teachers by District									Teacher Totals	%
16	Selector	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I		
	ESL Coordinator	2	1	–	–	–	2	–	–	2	7	43.4
	TESL	1	–	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	2	12.4
	Assistant Principal	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	1	2	12.4
	Dept. Chairman	–	–	–	–	–	1	2	–	–	3	18.6
	Departmental Effort	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	6.2
17	Basis for Selection											
	No response	3	1	1			3	3		2	14	86.8
	Central Board Recommendation									2	2	12.4
18	Was teacher consulted?											
	Yes	–	1	1	–	–	2	2	–	–	6	37.2
	No	3	–	–	–	–	2	1	–	4	10	62.0
19	Who prepared list?											
	D.C.E.S.L.	1	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	–	2	12.4
	ESL Coordinator at school	–	–	–	–	–	3	–	–	–	3	18.6
	TESL	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	
	Central Board List	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	3	18.6
	Dept. Chrman	–	–	1	–	–	–	1	–	–	2	12.4
	Didn't know	1	1	1	–	–	1	1	–	2	6	37.2

Thirty-seven per cent of the teachers responding indicated that they did not know who had prepared any list that might have been used in the selection of texts, while others indicated that the DCESL, the ESL coordinator, the Department Chairman or the Central Office at the Board was responsible for preparing the list.

VI. THE CENTRAL ESL STAFF

The Central ESL Staff at the Board of Education includes an Assistant Director (appointed in the Spring of 1970), four teachers assigned as supervisors under the Assistant Director, and one supervisor designated as coordinator of the two linguistic reading projects, exclusive of other staff members who are in charge of the non-public school ESL programs and the science-in-Spanish project. The staff is responsible for coordinating the overall program, providing teacher training and classroom supervision, offering consultative services and developing new curriculum materials as well. Its services are available to the fifteen districts which have district coordinators, and fourteen districts which do not.

In June the evaluation team was told that four of the five supervisors would no longer be employed at the Central Board and would have to find jobs wherever they could in the school system. Letters were sent out by the office of the Superintendent of Schools informing District Superintendents of the availability of the four supervisors; who had been informed verbally of the termination of their positions. The reason given for this termination was that decentralization would preclude the need for a Centralized ESL Staff.

The other supervisor was to continue working from the Board Office to coordinate ESL efforts in the high schools in the city.

The appointment of the Assistant Director in charge of ESL was an enigmatic one. Although his ESL experience is limited in terms of his potential for providing leadership in the field, he is strong on administrative and supervisory experience. Any question concerning the appointment, however, is based on examination of paper credentials and is to be considered tentative, subject to the performance of the man on the job over a period of time. His willingness to cooperate with the evaluators from the time he appared on the scene was outstanding, a trait he shares with his predecessor.

VII. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A Summary

1. The TESL

a. There is a broad diversity between the license requirements for TESLs and the credentials offered by teachers surveyed in the program, especially in terms of specific course requirements.

b. Most of the TESLs at the elementary level specialized in Elementary education and those at the secondary level in languages. Few have TESL degrees or specialization, though some have attended NDEA Institutes and/or in-service courses.

c. Most have little ESL teaching experience, the average being less than 2 years for both the elementary and the secondary teachers surveyed.

d. The teacher ratings on the teacher observation checklist (appendix B) ranged from 0.62 (between unacceptable and poor) for one secondary teacher to 3.90 (almost excellent) for one elementary school teacher, with the average scores being 2.08 and 2.60 for elementary and secondary respectively, perhaps reflecting the fact that the majority of the elementary school teachers surveyed have many more years of teaching experience in general, if not in TESL.

e. The "TESLs" assigned under Title I funds proved to have little or no TESL background or experience, according to data obtained for 45% (16) of the 35 personnel so assigned. Only 25% held TESL licenses and 43% have never taken any courses in ESL, linguistics, or English grammatical structures. 62% have never taken an in-service course but 25% did manage to participate in NDEA Institutes.

f. Only 28.6% and 25% of the elementary and secondary school teachers responding to the survey are members of their own professional organization, Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), and, as a result, do not have immediate at-home access to the *TESOL Quarterly*, an excellent professional journal that is concerned with practical more than theoretical considerations.

g. TESLS indicated that the strengths of their programs were such things as small class size, the nature of an ESL program, and the daily contact with their ESL students, obviously from teachers who once met with ESL students less often.

h. TESLs indicated that their programs needed more TESLs, more contact-time, more adequate space, more and better materials, and ESL-oriented materials for other subject areas.

i. Educational Assistants in the person of paraprofessionals, bilingual professional assistants and teaching assistants were considered effective by the 14% of the elementary and 50% of secondary school teachers that had such aids.

2. The Merrill and the Miami Linguistic Reading Projects

Those students who have completed the projects are reading at, near, or above grade level and city-wide norms and at or above the average levels for the poverty districts in which they are located. In fact, those who have completed the projects are reading, respectively, at the same level or better than 55% of all second grade students and 60% of all third grade students in the city system on the Metropolitan Reading Achievement Test, a text not designed for testing the special reading problems of non-native speakers.

3. Students, their Placement and Evaluation

a. Unsurprising to any one who knows the City is the fact that the largest non-native speaking language group is Spanish-speaking, though there are areas of the city with pockets of predominantly French-speaking (Haitian, primarily) and Chinese students with their various dialects.

b. Much of the placement of students is handled strictly by an interview, more often than not with a bilingual professional aiding or conducting the interview.

c. The end-of-semester measurement of the students' English language proficiency is almost always based on the teacher's evaluation based on the English Language Rating Scale (although there was no indication as to whether the old scale or the experimental one was being utilized), with the aid of an oral test (by 53% of the teachers) in the elementary schools surveyed and teacher-prepared written tests designed for ESL students (by 50% of the teachers) in the secondary schools surveyed.

d. The question concerning the decision to put ESL students in the mainstream (No. 29) was meaningless for the elementary school teacher since the students are already in the mainstream and attended ESL classes strictly on a "pull-out" basis.

This decision is made by the TESL and the school (rather than the district) coordinator of ESL, but none of the teachers responding indicated the basis on which the decision was made.

Comments on the teacher Observation Checklists by Evaluators suggested that there were students of a wide range (from nil proficiency to almost bilingual) in the same classes.

e. Several teachers indicated that ESL children are sometimes pushed out of the ESL classes by more needy students. The limits of space and an insufficient number of TESLs being contributing factors.

4. Space and Time

The average ESL elementary and secondary level classes meet for 45 minute periods, once daily for the former and from one to five times daily for the latter.

Many of the classes met in inadequate class facilities – a cafeteria, with three other groups; rooms without chalkboards or bulletin boards; rooms not much larger than a large closet; rooms with few windows and poor lighting.

The problem of space is closely tied to the concept of the pull-out program in the elementary schools since, more often than not, the TESL does not have an official room of her own.

5. Curriculum

a. In The Elementary Schools

1. Eight different texts or series were being used by five or more teachers in two or more of the eight districts surveyed. A total of eleven other books were listed by the teachers surveyed.

2. Twelve different books or series were listed as common source or reference materials by at least five different teachers in two or more districts with a total of thirty-three other texts listed, indicating teacher awareness of available materials.

3. Although 42% of the teachers indicated that they selected their own textbooks (from a variety of sources, sometimes including only what happened to be on hand), 52% indicated that they were not consulted at all.

b. In the Secondary Schools

1. Again, eight different texts were listed as used by at least two of the six districts surveyed; four of the eight texts are also used at the elementary level.

2. Interestingly, although twenty-three different texts were listed as source or reference materials used only by the teacher, not one of these was used by more than one teacher.

3. Only 12% of the teachers selected their own texts, and 62% were not consulted at all.

6. The Central ESL Staff

The new Assistant Director of English in charge of ESL will need time to familiarize himself with personnel, materials and procedures before he might be expected to provide any kind of leadership.

Four of the five supervisor-consultants working at the Central office have been terminated as of the end of June, 1970.

7. The DCESLs

a. TESLs in each of the districts in the survey relied heavily on aid from the DCESL, and were apparently quite satisfied with the quality of supervision they were receiving.

b. In the elementary schools, 65% of the teachers in the survey indicated that when they needed help with their ESL classes, it was the DCESL that they contacted.

c. Only 31% of the secondary school teachers in the survey indicated that they contacted the DCESL with ESL problems, but the lower percentage reflects the presence of individual school coordinators of ESL.

B. Recommendations

1. License Requirements

The evaluating team has conjectured that the flexibility of requirements for the T.E.S.L. license is designed to preclude the automatic exclusion of teachers who have been (unlicensed) T.E.S.L.s for years. This is a commendable attitude, but it is suggested that all experienced TESLs who do not have TESL licenses be given a limited time period in which to pass the test, after which eligibility requirements for both licenses could be strengthened by requiring that:

a. Any college-supervised student-teaching experience be in teaching English as a second language as it was *in toto* for the original secondary school license and as it was for the original elementary school license, one-half of the total supervised student-teaching experience, and

b. The Master's degree be in teaching English as a second language and not in an undefined "related to" the field of teaching English as a second language and

c. That the 30 semester hours of graduate study in lieu of the Master's degree requirement be such that they be equivalent to a Master's degree in teaching English as a second language and not "distributed among the liberal arts, the social and behavioral sciences, and professional study of education,

including, ... social psychology, or any combination thereof." This is not to suggest that the aggregation of the credits so listed could not be equivalent to a Master's degree in T.E.S.L. Rather, this recommendation is made in order to assure that they do.

d. That the in-lieu-of college supervised student-teaching proviso for secondary schools be restricted to one year of teaching English as a second language and eliminate the alternative of teaching a modern foreign language, and

e. That the same in lieu of proviso for elementary schools stipulate that half of the year of teaching elementary school be restricted to teaching English as a second language (Kg-6)

f. That the 6 semester hours in the structure of modern English, introductory linguistics . . . or in any combination thereof be increased to twelve semester hours for the secondary school license as it already is for the elementary. Provision for this extension exists for the student within the 30 semester hour requirement if he selects English or a modern foreign language, but it should be specified. Still more specifically, all prospective licensees should be required to do course work in the structure of the English language, the knowledge of which underlies (if it is not made explicit) all work in teaching English as a a second language.

These alterations would contribute to the establishment of a well-defined professional license through which a satisfactory definition of a T.E.S.L. could evolve.

In addition, consideration should be given to revising the test procedure for licensing in this field, a field which is more dependent upon teaching classroom techniques, procedures, approach and attitude than most. Consideration should be given to a procedure wherein the prospective licensee might be asked, given a topic to teach, to indicate

a. What texts he might use as sources for materials
b. What grammatical structures he would try to utilize as an underlying controlling factor.
c. What pronunciation problems related to the grammatical material he should prepare the student for
d. How he would distribute the vocabulary in the lesson to be taught as to which vocabulary items might be used for productive use and which vocabulary items would be limited to receptive understanding.
e. What audio-visual aids he might use for the lesson.

He would then be asked to prepare a lesson plan and to describe the methodology he would use to integrate the various phases of the lesson indicated in a – e above.

Naturally, the most desirable test would be to have him actually teach the lesson to a group of non-English speaking children but, undeniably, time, availability of students and other factors including a measuring instrument, would make such a procedure difficult to administer. The scoring of even the procedure suggested above would add to the already numerous problems confronting the Board of Examiners.

2. Classroom Performance

Any teacher – inexperienced teachers, or teachers with only a little experience, and even teachers with a great deal of experience can profit from thoughtful visitations followed by well-considered, honest criticism. With all the responsibilities DCESLs have they can not be expected to increase the number of visits they already make.

A possible key to better teacher performance is to involve the teacher more by focusing on the need for more self-evaluation:

a. What happened in class today?
b. What worked especially well?
c. Why? What did I do? How did I do it?
d. Can I apply that to something else?
e. What didn't work so well?
f. Why? What did I do? How did I do it?
g. Can I approach it in another way?
h. Can I use another technique?
i. Can I get (do I want) an observer to see me try it the next time?

Undoubtedly, many teachers do this already, but those who do not would probably prefer to work at this than face the prospect of "being observed again".

3. Professional Obligations

3. The Board, The Principals, the Union . . . all school personnel should campaign to enlist all T.E.S.L.s to become members of and, moreover, to become involved in their professional organization, T.E.S.O.L.

Reading the *TESOL Quarterly* regularly may provide a clue to handling a difficult problem, or, even better, might encourage teachers to submit articles describing a technique that worked particularly well for them.

4. Strengths and Needs

Since definite strengths in programs were cited, programs not having such things as a regular ESL program, small ESL classes, and daily contact between TESLS and ESL pupils, should be encouraged to work in the direction of achieving them.

At the same time, the statements of program needs should not go unheeded. More TESLs are needed and many are probably available as a result of having taken and passed the license examinations during 1969 and 1970. More ESL positions should be made available, especially in, but not limited to, the poverty area schools to provide sound ESL instruction. No student should ever be pushed out of an ESL program to make room for a more needy one. He should be able to remain until he "graduates" from the ESL program based on a validated, reliable instrument.

More TESLs would provide the opportunity to offer two or three 45-minute ESL periods a day in the elementary schools rather than the one class typically held currently. Awareness of available and new materials is the responsibility of all TESLs, CESLs and DCESLs so that they can recommend to principals and assistant principals new books that should be ordered in the future. Once again, the *TESOL Quarterly* would play a useful role since it not only lists new publication but reviews many as well.

The problem of ESL-oriented materials for the subject areas is one which might provide an incentive for TESLs, CESLs and DCESLs to prepare proposals for government funds to support the preparation of such materials.

Since the educational assistants who participated during this past year were found to be effective attempts should be made to provide such assistants for more classes.

5. The Merrill and the Miami Linguistic Reading Programs.

The apparent success, in terms of standardized test scores, met by those students who have completed either program should be an incentive to ensure that those students who have only partially completed the programs be given the opportunity to do so.

If time is all that is needed to produce non-native speakers who can compete with native speakers in terms of reading ability, then the time and the teachers who have experience with these materials should be made available to continue these programs to completion. Too, dissemination of information concerning these materials and the results of this pilot study might aid teachers who are looking for "better materials."

6. Student Placement and Evaluation

Probably the major problem confronting ESL programs across the nation is satisfactory measuring instruments. Until satisfactory instruments are prepared, however, more must be done about placement and evaluation than an interview, unless the interview is formalized and used universally, in every school in the City so that placement will be consistent and have meaning if a student moves to another school or district. This problem of appropriate placement is tied directly to "curriculum articulation" and will be pursued again in the next section.

7. Curriculum Articulation

That the nucleus for a reasonable amount of curriculum articulation is present can be seen by the numbers of books that are used in common districts spread throughout the city. Books, however, are not sufficient unto themselves.

A curriculum to be followed in every beginner group ("from "point A" to a given point, maybe "G") is an absolute necessity even if a given group does not achieve "point G," for if he stops at "E" or "F," it is at least known what he has studied before, and where the next teacher should begin.

Such a curriculum organization has been laid out in the *Handbook for Language Arts, Pre-K-2,* chapter six on ESL. The problem is in seeing to it that pupils are placed appropriately in terms of what they already know so that they can go on to learn what they still do not have active control over.

8. The Central ESL Staff and the DCESLs

These two groups are tightly interconnected and the more the central staff is broken down, the greater the responsibilities and the problems will be for the DCESLs.

It seems possible that the Board might be phasing out the centralized ESL office, and if it does so, the DCESLs will be asked to carry an additional load. However, what consideration is being given to those districts without DCESLs – who will provide supervision, guidance and leadership?

These questions are rhetorical and are based only on the impressions received by the evaluators, who sincerely hope that they are wrong.

APPENDIX A

Last Name _____ First Name _____ School Number or Name _____

School Address _____ District # _____

Dear Teacher:

Attached you will find a questionnaire for teachers consisting of forty questions designed to elicit various kinds of information about you and your classroom activities. This questionnaire was prepared for use as part of an evaluation of ESL in the New York City schools.

We would sincerely appreciate your cooperation in taking the time to respond to the questionnaire as carefully and completely as possible. If you find that a particular question is not appropriate to your situation, please omit that question.

Since we are interested in the total picture rather than each of you as individuals, we ask that you do not put your name on the questionnaire, but instead, put your name, school with address and district number in the spaces provided at the top of this sheet.

Please be sure to return this sheet with the completed questionnaire in the return envelope provided no later than Monday, June 15, 1970.

Thank you for your cooperation in this endeavor.

Sincerely yours,

Harvey Nadler
Director, Evaluation Team

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS

Prepared for ESEA Title I Project:
Improving the Teaching of English
As A Second Language. (1969-70)

A. Experience

1. What N.Y.C. licenses do you hold?_____
2. a) How long have you been teaching? _____years

   b) How long have you been teaching ESL? _____years

3. How many different ESL classes do you teach each day? _____

4. How many non-ESL classes do you teach each day? _____

5. How many periods do you see your ESL classes each day?_____

6. How long is each ESL period? _____ minutes

7. If you teach your ESL classes other subjects as well, please list these subjects:_____

   _____

8. How would you characterize your classroom methodology? (Please check one.)

   Audio-lingual _____

   Direct Method _____

   Grammar/translation _____

   Other (please describe)_____

9. When ESL students graduate from your school, do you think that their English language proficiency would permit them to compete with native-speaking students?

   YES _____

   NO _____

   Explanation (if you wish) _____

   _____

   _____

10. What is the greatest strength of the ESL program at your school?

_____

_____

_____

11. What is the most glaring need of the ESL program at your school?

_____

_____

_____

12. a) Do you have any personnel to assist you in the ESL classroom?

_____ YES _____ NO

paraprofessionals _____

teaching assistant _____

bilingual professional asst. _____

b) How effectively does this person perform?

very effective _____

effective _____

adequate _____

poor _____

13. How did you become involved in teaching ESL?

_____

_____

_____

B. Classroom Materials

14. What textbook(s) do both you and your students use? (Please list separately for each class.)

class/grade	texts (author, title, publisher, date)
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

15. In addition, please list any reference/source materials that you use but the students do not. (Specify for each class, please.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

16. Who selected the textbook(s) you use for your ESL classes? (name or title)

_____

17. If you know, please state the basis for the selection:

_____

18. Were you consulted on the selection of the textbooks?

YES_____ NO_____

19. If yes, who prepared the list from which you choose? (name or title)

_____

20. If you had the choice, please list the textbook(s) (supplementary or replacement) you would select for each class you teach. If they are the same as you are using, please write *same.*

class/grade	texts
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

21. What audio-visual aids are available at your school? (Please check)

Flash cards _____

Wall Charts _____

Flannel Boards _____

Tape Recorders _____

ESL Tapes _____

Movie Projector _____

Movies for ESL pupils _____

Film Strips _____

Language Master _____

Language Laboratory _____

Number of booths _____

Type:
a) listen only _____
b) listen and record _____
c) listen, record & playback
Other (please list) _____

22. Please list any audio-visual aids that are not available at your school that you would like to have.

_____

_____

23. Please list the audio-visual aids that you use starting with the one you find most useful.

_____

_____

_____

C. Students

24. What is the student make-up of your ESL classes?

	Class 1	2	3	4	5
Language					
1) Native-English	_____	___	___	___	___
2) Non-native Eng.	_____	___	___	___	___
a) Spanish	_____	___	___	___	___
b) Chinese	_____	___	___	___	___
c) French	_____	___	___	___	___
d)	_____	___	___	___	___
e)	_____	___	___	___	___
f)	_____	___	___	___	___

25. On what basis are students placed in your ESL classes? (Please check as appropriate.)

Written test _____
Oral test _____
Interview _____
I do not know _____
Other (please describe) _____

_____

26. If an interview is used, who conducts it?

_____ (title)

27. Do you use the Board of Education English language Rating Scale?

YES_____ NO_____

28. How is the student's English language proficiency measured at the end of the semester?

Written test designed for ESL students _____
Written test used for all students _____
Oral test _____
Teacher's evaluation _____
Other (please describe) _____

_____

29. Who decides when an ESL student is ready to join the regular school program with native-speaking students?

_____ (title)

30. How is this decision made?

_____

_____

_____

Teacher Training

31. Please list degrees held and specialization under each.

Degree	Year Granted	Institution	Specialization	Minor(s)
1.				
2.				
3.				

32. List and approximate dates and place at which you attend any ESL NDEA Institutes or Consortia.

	Dates	Institutions
a.		
b.		
c.		

33. Please list approximate dates and name or supervisor/trainer of any ESL in-service courses you attended.

	Dates	Number of sessions	Name of trainer
a.			
b.			
c.			
d.			
e.			

34. Please check which of the following courses you have had and list the number of credits and the institutions at which they were taken.

Course	No. of Credits	Institution
a. TESL: Theory, Methods, Materials		
b. Introductory Linguistics		
c. Phonology and/or Phonetics		
d. Contrastive Linguistics		
e. English Grammatical Structures		
f. Transformational Generative Grammar		
g. Other (as pertinent, list)		

_____

_____

35. Are you a member of TESOL? YES_____ NO_____

36. Have you attended any of the TESOL Conventions? YES_____ NO_____

Where? _____

37. Do you think that your ESL classes are successful? YES_____ NO_____

Reasons, if any_____

_____

_____

_____

38. a) How often are you visited in your classroom during the school year by:

	# of visits	quality (see b.)
1. District ESL Coordinator		
2. Central Bd. ESL Coordinator		
3. Other ESL teacher/supervisor at your school		
4. Department Chairman		

b) Please rate the quality of cooperation and guidance you received from each of the preceding on the basis of:

5 = excellent
4 = good
3 = fair
2 = poor
1 = very poor
0 = not applicable

39. When you need help with your ESL classes, whom do you ask?

_____ (title)

40. What additional ESL training would you like to have, if any?
(Please check)

a. additional lectures on
   1) ESL _____
   2) Linguistics _____
   3) English Grammar _____
   4) Other _____
b. periodic formal seminars _____
c. informal discussion groups _____
d. Please list any other _____

APPENDIX "B"

Prof. Nadler
Prof. Willis
Prof. Marelli
Prof. Martiniz of
New York University

EACHER OBSERVATION CHECKLIST

repared for Title III Evaluation: ESL Programs –
oard of Education of the City of New York

ating System: N/A = not applicable; 0 = unacceptable; 1 = poor; 2 = acceptable; 3 = good; 4 = excellent

	N/A	0	1	2	3	4	Comments
Attitude/Manner							
Knowledge and Use of student names							
Ask question, then call on student							
Awareness of Student Needs							
Speech Pattern: colloquial; normal classroom speed.							
How much did the teacher talk? Ratio of teacher/student talk?							
Was focus of lesson clear?							
How well was new material introduced?							
How well was material practiced after introduction?							
). How much practice with new material?							
. How well was drill extended into communication?							
. Was the model appropriate for correct responses?							
. Instructions and Cueing: Did students know what teacher expected?							
. Variety of activities/change of pace							
. Distribution of student participation among group. Are all students participating?							
. How well was "previously learned" material practiced, reviewed and reinforced?							
. How well were corrections made?							

	N/A	0	1	2	3	4	Comments
8. How well were students' questions answered by the teacher?							
9. How well were explanations made?							
0. How well was at-home follow-up accomplished?							
1. How well were audio-visual aids employed?							
2. Did teacher recognize difference between teaching and testing?							
3. Did lesson have a beginning, a middle, and an end?							
4. How well did teacher proceed from known to unknown?							
5. How well did teacher proceed from receptive to productive?							
6. How well did teacher proceed from simple to complex?							
7. How well did teacher proceed from concrete to abstract?							
8. How well did teacher proceed from manipulation to communication?							
9. How effective was practice in listening?							
0. How effective was practice in speaking?							
1. How effective was practice in reading?							
2. How effective was practice in writing?							
3. How effective was choral practice?							
4. How effective was individual practice?							
5. If teacher used student's native language, how effectively was it done?							

	N/A	0	1	2	3	4	Comments
How effectively were these techniques used? 36. repetition after the teacher model?							
37. response to language cues?							
38. initiation of communication situations by students?							
39. How did teacher evaluate student comprehension and progress?							

STUDENT OBSERVATION CHECKLIST

1. What was the classroom atmosphere and the rapport among students?							
2. What was level of student interest?							
3. What was student attitude toward materials?							
How effective was individual student participation in: 4. repetition?							
5. response?							
6. initiation?							
7. Did students seem to understand the teacher?							
8. Did students seem to understand the material?							
9. Did students use English outside of lesson framework?							
10. Did students correct each other?							

APPENDIX "C"

Workshop Schedules – Linguistic Reading Programs

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICES OF INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES
BUREAU OF ENGLISH
ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE AND BILINGUAL PROGRAMS
131 Livingston Street, Brooklyn, New York 11201

MIAMI LINGUISTIC READERS PROJECT WORKSHOP

Date: September 29, 1969
Place: P.S. # 6-M, 45 East 81st Street, New York 10028
Attendance: Teachers and Educational Assistants who are working in the Project for the first time; School Year 1969-70
Workshop Director: Mrs. Evelyn Kleban

AGENDA

9:00-9:30 a.m.	Background of the Project in the Pilot Schools
9:30-10:00 a.m.	Background, Philosophy and Methodology of the Reading Series
10:00-10:30 a.m.	COFFEE BREAK
10:30-12 Noon	Examination of the Materials 1. Analysis of Linguistic development: needs of Spanish background children 2. Comparative Analysis of English-Spanish: *Handbook for Language Arts: Pre K; Kindergarten; Grades One and Two.*
12:00-1:00 p.m.	LUNCH
1:00 p.m.-3:00 p.m.	Use of the *Big Books:* ESL Techniques 1. Modeling by Teacher Choral Repetition Small group Repetition Individual Repetition 2. Oral Language Drills Repetition Substitution Transformation 3. Backward Buildup

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICES OF INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES
ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE AND BILINGUAL PROGRAMS
131 Livingston Street, Brooklyn, New York 11201

MERRILL LINGUISTIC READERS PROJECT – WORKSHOP

Date:	September 30, 1969
Place:	Bureau of Curriculum Development 131 Livingston Street Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201 Library-6th Floor
Attendance:	Teachers and Educational Assistants working in the Project for the first time: school year 1969-70.
Workshop Director:	Mrs. Evelyn Kleban

AGENDA

9:00-9:30 a.m.	Introduction of people in workshop.
9:30-10:30 a.m.	Background of Project in the Pilot Schools. Philosophy and Methodology of the Reading series: *Linguistics and Reading* by Dr. Charles C. Fries.
10:30-11:00 a.m.	COFFEE BREAK
11:00-12:00 Noon	Examination of materials. Presentation of Matrices of spelling patterns Sentence structures.
12:00-1:00 p.m.	LUNCH
1:00-3:00 p.m.	ESL Techniques. 1. Teacher modeling Class response Small group response Individual response 2. Oral Language Drills Repetition Substitution Transformation 3. Backward Build-up

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICES OF INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES
BUREAU OF ENGLISH
ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE AND BILINGUAL PROGRAMS
131 Livingston Street, Brooklyn, New York 11201

Miami Linguistic Readers Project – Workshop

Workshop: October 28, 1969
Place: P.S. 6–M, 45 East 81 Street, N.Y. 10028
Attendance: All teachers and Educational Assistants working in the Project; school year 1969-70 . . . Workshop Drctr, Mrs. Evelyn Kleban

AGENDA

9:00-9:30 a.m. Introduction of new teachers to the project.
Mrs. Evelyn Kleban

9:30-10:00 a.m. Demonstration Lesson
"Beyond the Big Books"
Chang's Shell – Level 8
Miss Suzanne Schanne

10:00-10:30 a.m. Discussion of Demonstration Lesson.
Miss Schanne D.C.Heath & Co.
Mrs. Kleban

10:30-11:00 a.m. COFFEE BREAK

11:00-12:00 Noon Distribution of Materials
Discussion of present indications of the project.

12:00-1:00 p.m. LUNCH

1:00-3:00 p.m. Using Handbook for Language Arts: ESL Methodology
Using New Materials
a. Drillkit
b. Supplementary Readers
Mrs. Kleban

Intergroup Discussion
a. Problems
b. Creative Materials and Activities developed by teachers.

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICES OF INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES
BUREAU OF ENGLISH
ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE AND BILINGUAL PROGRAMS
131 Livingston Street, Brooklyn, New York 11201

MERRILL LINGUISTIC READERS PROJECT – WORKSHOP

Workshop:	October 29, 1969
Place:	Bureau of Special Services 131 Livingston Street Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201 Library-6th Floor
Attendance:	All teachers and Educational Assistants working in the Project; school year 1969–70. . . . Workshop Director, Evelyn Kleban

AGENDA

9:00-9:30 a.m.	Introduction of teachers new to the project.	Mrs. Evelyn Kleban
9:30-10:00 a.m.	After "Not is a Fat Cat" What? Demonstration Lesson	Miss Pearl Rosenblum P.S. # 1-K
10:00-10:30 a.m.	Discussion of Lesson.	Mrs. Kleban
10:30-11:00 a.m.	COFFEE BREAK	
11:00-12:00 Noon	Distribution of Materials Discussion of present indications of the project.	
12:00-1:00 p.m.	LUNCH	
1:00-3:00 P.M.	Using the *Language Arts Handbook:* ESL Methodology Discussion of new materials Intergroup Discussion: a. Problems b. Creative additions to the materials to meet special problems.	

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF STATE AND FEDERALLY ASSISTED PROGRAMS
ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE
AND
BILINGUAL PROGRAMS
131 LIVINGSTON STREET
BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201

CLELIA C. BELFROM
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR (ACTING)
624-5208

CONSULTANTS
FRANK A. FRIULI – 624-5057
SECONDARY SCHOOLS
EVELYN KLEBAN – 624-5057
LINQUISTIC READING PROJECTS
BLANCA ORTIZ – 624-5057
ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
MARVIN J. PEKKALA – 624-5056
ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
CARMEN S. SANGUINETTI – 624-5055
SCIENCE-SPANISH
ROSE SCARANGELLA – 624-5056
NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

APRIL LOU – 624-5056
ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

January 22, 1970

TO: PRINCIPALS OF MIAMI AND MERRILL LINGUISTIC READERS PILOT PROJECT

Ladies and Gentlemen:

In accordance with the decision made at the conference of Project Principals held on May 15, 1969 at the Curriculum Bureau, there will be a workshop for all teachers in the project on February 5, 1970 from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. at the Bureau of Audio-Visual Instruction, Studio A, 131 Livingston Street, Brooklyn, N.Y.

Our Title I Proposal has provision for the cost of the substitute for that day who can be engaged to cover the class or classes involved. Would you please notify your payroll secretary to enter Code Number 7135 in Column 8 on Form A-21, Per Diem Service Report.

It if is possible to release any Educational Assistants who are in the program assigned to project classes, I think it would be helpful to have them attend the workshop too.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

EVELYN KLEBAN
BUREAU OF ENGLISH
ESL Consultant-
in charge of Special
Reading Projects

EK:jo
APPROVED:
1/22/70

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICES OF INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES
BUREAU OF ENGLISH
ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE AND BILINGUAL PROGRAMS
131 Livingston Street, Brooklyn, New York 11201

MERRILL AND MIAMI LINGUISTIC READERS PROJECT – WORKSHOP

Date: February 5, 1970
Place: Bureau of Audio-Visual Instruction-Studio A, 3rd Floor
131 Livingston Street, Brooklyn, N.Y.
Attendance: Teachers and Educational Assistants working in the Project: school year 1969-70

Workshop Director: Mrs. Evelyn Kleban

AGENDA

9:30-10:30 a.m. Teacher Training Films
1. Progression in Teaching English as a Second Language
2. Advanced Enrichment Practice in Teaching of English as a Second Language

10:30-11:30 a.m. Discussion of the philosophy and methodology of the Films

11:30-12:45 p.m. LUNCH

12:45-1:30 p.m. Application of the methods of the films to materials of the Miami and Merrill Readers
Group I Miami Readers
Group II Merrill Readers

1:30-3:00 p.m. ESL Techniques demonstrated by groups with the Reader materials
1. Teacher modeling
Class response
Small group response
Individual response

2. Oral Language Drills
Repetition
Substitution
Transformation

3. Backward Build-up

P. S. Please bring Teachers Manual of a group with whom you are now working.

– S A M P L E –

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF STATE AND FEDERALLY ASSISTED PROGRAMS
ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE
131 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201

February 1970

To Principals of Miami Linguistic Readers Pilot Project

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Schedule of Monthly Visits:
Tuesday, February 20th

_____

_____

_____

Inclosed are duplicates for the teachers involved in the program.

Very truly yours,

(Mrs.) Evelyn Kleban
ESL Consultant: In charge
of Special Reading Projects

EK: av

Enclosure

Appendix "D"

Item	Author	Title
1.	Wheller, Gonzalez	*Let's Speak English*
2.	Bumpass, F.	*The New We Learn English*
3.	Alesi, G. and D. Pantell	*First Book in American English*
4.	Finocchiaro, M.	*Learning to Use English*
5.	Boggs, R. S. and R. J. Dixson	*English Step by Step with Pictures*
6.	Lancaster, Louise	*Introducing English*
7.	Collier Macmillan	*English This Way*
8.	Cotto, L. et al	*American English Series*
9.	Board of Education	*Handbook for Language Arts, Pre-K – 2*
10.	Lismore, D.	*Welcome to English*
11.	Board of Education	*Resource Units* (various grade levels)
12.	Board of Education	*Teaching English to Puerto Rican Pupils*
13.	Bernardo, L. and D. Pantell	*English – Your New Language*
14.	Science Research Assoc.	*Distar*
15.	American Guidance Svcs. Inc.	*Peabody Language Kit*
16.	Finocchiaro, M.	*English as a Second Language – from theory to practice*
17.	D. C. Heath	*The Miami Linguistic Readers*
18.	Scott-Foresman	*English Around the World*
19.	Dixson, R. J.	*Beginning Lessons in English*
20.	McGraw Hill; NCTE	*English for Today*
21.	Macmillan	*English 900*